

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 17-18, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-30, and 34 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no new matter. Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-30, and 34 are pending and are in condition for allowance.

Amendments to the Specification

Amendments to the specification are being made to overcome numbering discrepancies between the specification and the drawings, and to correct a computer descriptor. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments to the specification. Applicants respectfully request entry of said amendments.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some reason—suggestions or

motivations—found either in the prior art references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to produce the claimed invention. See *Application of Bergel*, 292 F.2d 955, 956-957 (CCPA 1961). Recently, the Supreme Court noted that the apparent reason to combine the elements in the fashion claimed by the [patent application] should be made explicit. *KSR v. Teleflex*, No. 04-1350, 550 U.S. 398 (2007).

B) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”).

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to include, inter alia, “a content blocking component that blocks the offensive portions of the message ... and fully displays non-offensive portions of the message.” Daniell describes a system and method of identifying a message that has potential offensive content, then moving it to a spam folder. Daniell does not describe blocking the offensive content only, but still displaying the non-offensive content. In addition, Examiner noted that Daniell discloses manually substituting words or phrases in place of offensive content, thereby ostensibly disclosing the claim 1 feature of, partially blocking content by preventing offensive portions of the message from being viewed. Currently amended and previously presented claim 1 include, “... a processor that executes the following *computer executable components* stored on a computer readable medium: a message receiving component ...; a filtering component ...; and a content blocking component ...” Therefore, *manually* blocking offensive portions does not disclose Applicants’ claim 1 for *computer executable* components.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell.

C) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0228899 (“Wendkos”).

Claims 1, 5-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and further in view of Wendkos. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to include, inter alia, “a content blocking component that blocks the offensive portions of the message ... and fully displays non-offensive portions of the message.” Daniell describes a system and method of identifying a message that has potential offensive content, then moving it to a spam folder. Daniell does not describe blocking the offensive content only, but still displaying the non-offensive content. Wendkos describes blocking out potential offensive content by stripping out all images and links from incoming e-mail [0008], as cited by Examiner. Wendkos would clearly be stripping out non-offensive content as well as offensive content, and therefore, does not disclose Applicants’ amended claim 1.

Daniell and Wendkos, either alone or in combination do not disclose independent claim 1 as amended, and therefore, independent claim 1 is now allowable over the prior art of record. Since claims 5-6 and 10 depend from independent claim 1, they are also allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5-6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and further in view of Wendkos.

D) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0228899 (“Wendkos”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0165895 (“Rajan”).

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 18-20, 22, 24-25, 27 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and Wendkos, and further in view of Rajan. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9, and 18-20 depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, amended independent claim 1 is now allowable over the prior art of record of Daniell and Wendkos. Rajan does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell and Wendkos. Therefore, dependent claims 2-4, 7, 9, and 18-20 are also allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the same reasons with regard to claim 1.

Independent claim 22 has been amended to include, inter alia, “... enabling a user to preview the non-offensive portions of the message in at least a preview pane while blocking the offensive portions of the message from the user when the junk score exceeds a threshold.” Daniell describes a system and method of identifying a message that has potential offensive content, then moving it to a spam folder. Daniell does not describe blocking the offensive content only, and still enabling a user to preview the non-offensive content. Wendkos describes blocking out potential offensive content by stripping out all images and links from incoming e-mail [0008], as cited by Examiner. Wendkos would clearly be stripping out non-offensive content as well as offensive content, and therefore, does not disclose Applicants’ amended claim 22. Rajan simply describes a method and apparatus for classifying electronic mail, and does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell and Wendkos. Therefore, amended independent

claim 22 is now allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 24, 25, and 27 depend from independent claim 22, and therefore are also allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claim 22.

Independent claim 34 has been amended to include, inter alia, "... means for blocking the offensive portions of the message associated with information deemed offensive to the user from being presented to the user, and displaying the non-offensive portions when the message is displayed in at least a preview pane, based on the junk score ..." Daniell describes a system and method of identifying a message that has potential offensive content, then moving it to a spam folder. Daniell does not describe blocking the offensive content only, and still displaying the non-offensive content. Wendkos describes blocking out potential offensive content by stripping out all images and links from incoming e-mail [0008], as cited by Examiner. Wendkos would clearly be stripping out non-offensive content as well as offensive content, and therefore, does not disclose Applicants' amended claim 34. Rajan simply describes a method and apparatus for classifying electronic mail, and does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell and Wendkos. Therefore, amended independent claim 34 is now allowable over the prior art of record.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4, 7, 9, 18-20, 22, 24-25, 27 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and Wendkos, and further in view of Rajan.

E) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 ("Daniell") and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0165895 ("Rajan").

Claims 22 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and further in view of Rajan. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

As discussed above, independent claims 22 and 34 have been amended to include, inter alia, the feature of blocking offensive portions of a message, while still displaying non-offensive portions of the message. Daniell describes a system and method of identifying a message that has potential offensive content, then moving it to a spam folder. Daniell does not describe blocking the offensive content only, and still displaying the non-offensive content. Rajan simply describes a method and apparatus for classifying electronic mail, and does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell.

Amended independent claims 22 and 34 are now allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and further in view of Rajan.

F) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0228899 (“Wendkos”) and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0009495 (“Adjaoute”).

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and Wendkos, and further in view of Adjaoute. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 11 depends from independent claim 1. Amended independent claim 1 is now allowable over the prior art of record, as discussed above. Adjaoute does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell and Wendkos. Therefore, claim 11 is also now allowable over the

prior art of record, at least for the reasons with regard to independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell and Wendkos, and further in view of Adjaoute.

G) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0228899 (“Wendkos”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0165895 (“Rajan”) and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0204569 (“Andrews”).

Claims 12-13, 15-17 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell, Wendkos, and Rajan, and further in view of Andrews. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 12-13 and 15-17 depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, amended independent claim 1 is now allowable over the prior art of record. Andrews does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell, Wendkos, or Rajan. The prior art of record does not describe Applicants’ amended independent claim 1, either alone or in any combination. Therefore, claims 12-13 and 15-17 are also now allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the reasons with regard to independent claim 1.

Claim 30 depends from independent claim 22. As discussed above, amended independent claim 22 is now allowable over the prior art of record. Andrews does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell, Wendkos, or Rajan. The prior art of record does not describe Applicants’ amended independent claim 22, either alone or in any combination. Therefore, claim 30 is also now allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the reasons with regard to independent claim 22.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12-13, 15-17, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell, Wendkos, and Rajan, and further in view of Andrews.

H) Obviousness Rejections Based on U.S. Publication No. 2005/0097174 (“Daniell”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0228899 (“Wendkos”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0165895 (“Rajan”) and U.S. Publication No. 2005/0080889 (“Malik”).

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell, Wendkos, and Rajan, and further in view of Malik. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 29 depends from independent claim 22. As discussed above, amended independent claim 22 is now allowable over the prior art of record. Malik does not compensate for the deficiencies of Daniell, Wendkos, or Rajan. The prior art of record does not describe Applicants’ amended independent claim 22, either alone or in any combination. Therefore, claim 29 is also now allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the reasons with regard to independent claim 22. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniell, Wendkos, and Rajan, and further in view of Malik.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29-, and 34 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 202/783-8400 or nberezny@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/NEMA BEREZNY/

Nema Berezny
Reg. No. 57,706

MGH/NOB/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550